

Rem rks

Claims 1-20 are pending, and claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1-20.

§ 102 Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent number 6,392,991 (Yamamoto). The Applications submit that claims 1-20 are novel and non-obvious in view of Yamamoto.

First, Yamamoto does not teach the parallel channels described in independent claim 1 of the pending application. Claim 1 describes "*parallel channels configured to transfer communications in parallel with a clock signal*". Yamamoto does not teach transferring communications in parallel with a clock signal over parallel channels. In support of the rejection, the Examiner cites column 10, lines 21-41 and the Abstract in Yamamoto. Neither of these sections in Yamamoto describe transferring communications in parallel with a clock signal over parallel channels. The Applicants could find no discussion in Yamamoto of transferring clock signals or clock information in parallel with communications over parallel channels. The Applicants ask the Examiner to read these sections again and clearly point out where this limitation is described.

Secondly, Yamamoto does not teach the crossbar integrated circuits of claim 1 of the pending application. Claim 1 describes "*crossbar integrated circuits configured to receive the communications and the clock signal over the parallel channels, switch the communications based on the clock signal, and transfer the switched communications to the parallel channels*". The switch in Yamamoto is not the same as the crossbar integrated circuits in claim 1 of the pending application. The switch in Yamamoto does not receive clock signals over the parallel channels. As previously stated, the Applicants could find no discussion in Yamamoto of transferring clock signals or clock information over parallel channels. Therefore, the switch in Yamamoto does not receive a clock signal over the parallel channels. If the switch in Yamamoto does not receive a clock signal over the parallel channels, then the switch cannot switch the communications based on the clock signal received over the parallel channels.

The switch in Yamamoto operates based on control signals from a switch controller.

There is no discussion about the clocking of the switch controller or that the switch controller receives clock signals over the parallel channels. Consequently, Yamamoto does not teach the crossbar integrated circuits of claim 1.

For these reasons, claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over Yamamoto. The same arguments apply to independent claim 11 and dependent claims 2, 4-7, 9-10, 12, 14-17, and 19-20.

§ 103 Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as anticipated by Yamamoto and admitted prior art. The Applicants submit that claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 are novel and non-obvious for the same reasons provided above.


Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are allowable. There may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1-20.

Any fees may be charged to deposit account 502622.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-13-04



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Brett L. Bornsen, Reg. No. 46,566
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 17
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 36122